



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

a miracle got up, as Father Foley himself told us, by this miserable relative of his for the especial accommodation of our incredulous curiosity. It will be seen in the narrative given elsewhere, that some time after the date of M. Aubert's invitation to Youghal, the girl had had it revealed to her that the miracle of the cording would not take place again. This revelation was so far made good in practice that it furnished an excuse for our being prevented from seeing the commencement of the miracle, but no further. For the accommodating she-saint interceded with Almighty God to allow the miracle to be repeated another 'last time' (as they have it at the theatres), for us known infidels and sceptics; and repeated it was—for us and for us only, but exactly in such a manner as to forbid all inquiry, to satisfy no reasonable doubt, and to convince no human being who was not determined to believe with or without evidence. So that it seems our incredulity was no obstacle to the performance of a miracle—nay, was the very cause of a miracle being performed. Almighty God worked a miracle for our especial gratification, but took care at the same time to work it in such a manner that no intellect above that of a goose could be convinced by it. But whenever the miracle would or might have been decisive of the matter in hand, then, forsooth, Almighty God was displeased with our incredulity, and would let us see the show no further. Out upon these idiotic impieties! Depend upon it, Father Foley, the castle theatre has another scene shifter than Almighty God.

"Mr. Foley imprecates upon himself all kind of ridicule if his pet lambs do not *baa* in the right dialect. If there is any deception in the case, he is 'one of the greatest dupes that ever stood on ground'; he is 'the fool of fools'; 'credulous beyond conception'; 'the ridicule of the world.' How far these terms have been wisely used by Father Foley, under the circumstances of this case, it is not for us to say; but most certainly the condition, upon the fulfilment of which he declares them applicable, has been fulfilled to the very letter. There have been 'cheat,' 'deception,' 'rogue,' and 'villainy' of so gross and palpable a kind—there has been, on Father Foley's part, so wilful and determined (though unconscious) a playing into the hands of the miscreants by whom his simplicity has been abused, that it would afflict us with no very great grief, if, according to his word, every stone in the Castle, and every stone in the College to boot, were levelled to the ground, and every vestige of these detestable enormities swept from the face of the earth for ever.

"Let us conclude this notice with a warning taken from a great saint whom Mr. Foley must hold in great reverence—a warning applicable even if these visions be supposed true, which we do not suppose them—a warning which we doubt not admits of an application not only to the seers of visions, but also to those who have the guardianship and direction of the seers. 'When visions are true,' says St. Bernardine of Sienna, 'they prove no man holy; for otherwise Balaam would have been holy, and his ass, too, that saw the angel.'"

It would appear that such fearless exercise of private judgment was not permitted to pass without reproof; and that Mr. Lucas was called to an account for his interference just as Mr. Scully had been reprimanded by Mr. Sheehan. For, on the 25th February, he finds it necessary to plead the emergency of the case, on the ground of *Protestant interference* leaving no alternative between coming manfully forward, as he did, or permitting Protestant denunciation and exposure openly to take the lead. He expressly refers to the notice of the transaction in what he calls the Tory papers, and which he had seen in DUBLIN; and gives the published papers of the Protestant ministers 'in extenso,' as justifying the course he and his rev. associates had adopted.

"He thus pleads his apology:—

"In the *Tablet* of the 25th February.

"ON THE PUBLICITY GIVEN TO THE YOUGHAL MIRACLES. "We promised last week to say a word or two in our present paper on some unfortunate circumstances connected with this business, which we could not then conveniently detail. We imagine, from one or two communications that have since reached us, that we should have done well to give these explanations before entering upon our exposure of the frauds in question.

"Several of our correspondents inquire why we did not leave Father Foley and his miracles to the judgment of his bishop, and why we presumed to meddle in these high clerical matters at all? We answer firmly, but respectfully, that we did so because the subject had first been made public by others, and not by us. If the matter had been kept private we should never have disturbed it, or raked it up, to the end of time. Even before we visited Youghal, the affair had been published in the Cork Orange paper. When we visited Youghal, it was public and notorious to all the neighbourhood for more than twenty miles round; and the castle and adjacent grounds were crowded with devout pilgrims coming from afar. But this was not all. Youghal, as all our readers may not be aware, is a town remarkable for its bigotry; and at that very time the 'swaddlers' of Youghal were making their excursions into the neighbouring towns (Lismore, &c.) to preach against and blaspheme our faith on the strength of these miracles. At this very time, then, as far as regards general notoriety and the impossibility of preserving secrecy, the miracles had been deliberately made public.

"But this we did not consider sufficient to warrant us in giving the matter a more general publicity. On the contrary, until it had been brought in a more definite shape before the public of Waterford, and, through that channel, before the readers of the *Morning Chronicle* and *Dublin Evening Mail*, we not merely held back, but exerted ourselves very earnestly and very seriously to prevent publication, in an instance to which we shall not more particularly allude. When the inaccurate statement of the *Waterford Chronicle* appeared, we thought (and most justly, as it afterwards proved) that an attempt would be made to bolster up the miracles by an indignant denial of these inaccuracies. To prevent this being done with success, we then, for the first time, mentioned the affair, admitted the incorrectness of the published version of the case, but stated, as strongly as we could, our own private belief, founded on personal examination, that the miracles were gross and detestable frauds; but we abstained from saying a single word that could be personally offensive to Father Foley, or to any human being who, in our opinion, was not a partaker in the fraud. Moreover, we were careful to state that we gave this merely as our own individual opinion, and without at all wishing to prejudice the case when the proper authorities should come to examine it. This paragraph was published in the *Tablet* of the fourth of February. On the first of February—that is, several days before the editor of this journal, or either of his reverend companions at Youghal, had said one word publicly on the subject—Father Foley addressed to the *Cork Examiner* a letter, in which he points out certain parties to public reprobation as scandalous for their unbelief, hands them over very quietly to the bottomless pit, and, in direct and formal terms, appeals from their individual, and at that time wholly unpublished, judgment, to the Pope, to the bishop, to 'the press,' to the public at large, and 'to the judgment of an enlightened public,' Protestant and Catholic. Father Foley himself thus called for and deliberately invited a public discussion through the press, and brought the matter from the jurisdiction of the bishop to the profane court of public opinion. There he brought it; and if he had been unanswerable, he pledged the credit of the Catholic Church, in his person as a priest, to all the malignant enemies of the Church, that these miracles were undoubtedly true, and that they admitted of being 'proved by many witnesses upon oath.' This letter of Father Foley's was reprinted in the Dublin Tory papers, in the London papers, and we dare say in most papers of the three kingdoms. We saw it with our own eyes hawked about the streets of Dublin, in a fly sheet, while a large printed board and the hawk at the top of his voice announced to all the curious, 'A full account of Father Foley's miraculous Nun at Youghal, whose hands and feet bleed every Friday at the same hour—price only one penny.'

"This ostentatious invitation by Father Foley himself to a public discussion would alone have justified us in coming forward to rebut publicly his published statements. But behold, the day before we left Dublin, we received a Cork Tory paper containing the following correspondence, which we lay before our readers *in extenso*."

[Here follow the documents, including the Protestant challenge, with an introductory letter to the editor of the *Cork Constitution*.]

"Now, observe the position of this affair. We three visitors had been—so Father Foley told us—appealed to by Heaven itself, which worked a miracle to remove our individual incredulity. We had, without a tittle of provocation, been publicly denounced by Father Foley, as scandalous for our incredulity. We saw a Catholic priest publicly appealing to the press and the public, and offering to prove upon oath the truth of his miracles. We saw this clergyman taken at his word by his Protestant neighbours, who tax his miracles with fraud, denounce the Church as an agent in the fraud, and openly challenge him to a rigorous and impartial investigation.

"Will any man tell us that we had so much as an option to keep silence under these circumstances, when we were in possession of facts known to no others but ourselves, and almost proving to demonstration the existence of the grossest and most abominable deception? Leave the matter to the bishop! Leave the matter to the proper authorities! That is, leave to the bishop the odium of entering upon an investigation to which he has been dared by the malignants around him, with the positive certainty that the investigation will lead to a detection, and the detection be made the foundation of every species of calumny against the bishop, and the proper authorities to boot. Leave the matter to the bishop! Would to God it had been left to the Bishop. We did not meddle or make in the affair until it had first of all been deliberately taken from the bishop, handed over to the public at large, and at length a formal appeal made by the clergyman himself to 'the press,' and the 'judgment of an enlightened public.' We beg respectfully to reply to those who blame us for interfering, that we have no apology to offer for so doing, but rather humbly conceive that we have done good service to the Church."

We think our readers will agree with us that the whole of the above narrative, not excepting Mr. Lucas's reluctant exposure of the fraud, though he and his friends "were in possession of facts known to no others but themselves, which proved to demonstration the existence of the grossest and most abominable deception," is not a little instructive, as illustrating how it is possible for similar frauds to escape public exposure in other places,

such as Assisi or the Tyrol, and as proving that but few Protestant free inquiry we might have as many stigmatized nuns, winking virgins, and bleeding pictures in Ireland as in the darkest regions of Austria or Italy.

We, perhaps, should add, that early in March, 1843, an authorised investigation took place.

"The subjects of the supposed divine favours were removed, on or about 2nd March, to a house a few miles distant. On that and the following day a commission, composed of several Roman Catholic priests and medical gentlemen, examined into the affair. It was found that the acting was excellent, and the self-command of the principal personages wonderful. Some temporary difficulty was experienced in ascertaining from whence was procured the blood which smeared the forehead; but at length the physicians prudently examined the interior of the mouth, and in each subject the lip or inside of the cheek was found to have been pierced in a manner that permitted blood to be drawn, at will, by suction.

"However, no authorised account of this conclusive investigation has been given to the public. A veil of oblivion is sought to be drawn over it. A simple announcement from the altar of the Romish chapel, in Youghal, that it was found to be NO MIRACLE, and a caution against committing sin by speaking on the subject, is all that is known to have been done on the final authoritative detection of the abominable blasphemy."

The collegiate establishment for the re-conversion of England did not long survive. Its eighty missionaries were scattered. Father Foley, after continuing his visits to his fair frail cousin as long as his health permitted, still professing his belief in the reality of the miracle, was called to his account, and, strange as it may appear after so disgraceful an exposure, his funeral, we are assured, was a public one, honoured by the attendance of large numbers of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of Youghal and the surrounding district! If the fraud had succeeded without public detection and exposure, we suppose that in due time he, or his cousin, or both, would have received the honours of canonization!

TITLE OF UNIVERSAL BISHOP.

WHEN treating of the African Church, we have already seen in what strong language St. Cyprian spoke in the Council of Carthage, A.D. 256, of the presumption of the Bishop of Rome in assuming superiority over other bishops; whereas he asserts that "every bishop had equal liberty of judging and determining upon any question which comes before him; and he can no more be judged by than he can judge another."

We have also shown in our last number that there is no pretence for saying that the Council of Chalcedon acceded the title of Universal Hierarch to Leo the Great, then Bishop or Archbishop of Rome.

Let us now go on a century later, and see whether, so late as the close of the 6th century, the Roman Pontiffs had any pretence for assuming such a title, or any other which would imply a supreme or monarchical power over other acknowledged patriarchs, such as those of Alexandria, Antioch, or Constantinople. On the contrary, at the close of the 6th century we shall find two successive Popes vehemently protesting against the title of *Universal Bishop*, when it was assumed by others, not on the ground that it implied an invasion of their own rights, but expressly because it bespoke an unseemly pride, and derogated from the dignity of all other patriarchs whose jurisdiction was coequal and independent, and that in language so strong as to involve an express disclaimer, both on behalf of themselves and their predecessors, of any similar authority or domination. The circumstance which led to this protest and disclaimer on the part of those two Popes, Pelagius II. and Gregory the Great, was the assumption of the title of *UNIVERSAL BISHOP* on the part of John, Patriarch of Constantinople, and his successor Cyriacus.

It may be doubtful, perhaps, what extent of jurisdiction John or Cyriacus really intended to assume by claiming such a title; but there was enough in the then state of the seat of empire, Constantinople, to excite the jealousy of the Roman Pontiffs, and it is not unlikely that they were correct in representing it as an attempt to assume the highest rank, and thereby displace old Rome, as the eastern metropolis had, with the assistance of the Council of Chalcedon, already displaced the other ancient Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

Pope Pelagius II., in his 7th epistle, the immediate predecessor of Gregory the Great, thus writes on the occasion, dealing with it as an assumption equivalent to a profane and impious claim of domination and supremacy on the part of the see of Constantinople over the whole Catholic Church:—

"Regard not," says he, "the name of *universality*, which John has unlawfully usurped to himself; for let no one of the patriarchs ever use this so profane appellation. You may well estimate what mischief may be expected rapidly to follow, when, even among priests,

* See supra, March number, p. 29.

b "Universalitatis nomen, quod sibi illicite usurpavit, nolite attendere:—nullus enim Patriarcharum hoc tam profano vocabulo unquam utatur. Perpenditis, fratres carissimi, qui de vicino subsequatur, cum et in sacerdotibus erumpunt tam perversa primordia. Quia enim iuxta est ille, de quo scriptum est: 'Ipse est rex super universos filios superbie.'—Labbe and Coss., tom. v., p. 949-50.

such perverted beginnings break forth. For He is near, respecting whom it is written, 'He Himself is King over all the sons of pride.'

Pope Gregory I., the immediate successor of Pelagius, is still stronger in his indignant protest against the arrogant pretensions of this same John of Constantinople, as the following extracts from four different epistles will show:—

"My fellow priest, John," says he, in his epistle addressed to the Emperor Maurice, "attempts to be called the UNIVERSAL BISHOP. I am compelled to exclaim:—Oh times! Oh manners! Priests seek to themselves names of vanity, and glory in new and profane appellations. Do I, in this matter, defend only my own proper cause? Do I vindicate an injury specially offered to myself? Do I not rather take up the cause of God omnipotent, and the cause of the Church universal? Far from the very hearts of Christians be that name of blasphemy, in which the honour of all priests is taken away, while it is madly arrogated to himself by a single individual!"

Again, in his epistle to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Anastasius of Antioch, he further writes—"No one of my predecessors ever consented to use this so profane appellation; for, if a single patriarch be styled UNIVERSAL, the name of patriarch is derogated from the others. But far, very far, be it from a Christian mind that any person should wish to snatch to himself a title, whence he may seem, even in any, the very smallest degree, to diminish the honour of his brethren!"

Again, his epistle, lib. v., No. 18, to John of Constantinople himself—"What wilt thou say to Christ, the true Head of the Universal Church, in the examination of the last judgment—thou who attempted to subjugate all his members to thyself by the appellation of UNIVERSAL? In the use of so perverted a title, who, I ask, is proposed for thy imitation, save he, who, despising the legions of angels, constituted in a social equality with himself, endeavoured to break forth to the summit of an unapproached singularity?"

And in epistle 31 (lib. vii.), to the Emperor Maurice, he still more emphatically says, "I, indeed, confidently assert, that whosoever either calls himself, or desires to be called, UNIVERSAL PRIEST, that person, in his vain elation, is the precursor of Antichrist, because through his pride he exalts himself above the others."

In these strong expressions, Pope Gregory spoke of the assumption of the title as blasphemy, a token of Antichrist, &c., &c., without any exception in his own favour, or of his successors; and Roman writers have been greatly perplexed by the difficulty of maintaining the claim of subsequent Popes to a title which Gregory the Great so broadly denied; for, even if it be true that the Emperor Phocas, at the beginning of the 7th century, made a grant of universal jurisdiction to the Bishop of Rome, it is manifest that he had no power to bestow any such jurisdiction beyond the limits of his own empire, even if such a grant could have laid any satisfactory foundation for the claim of the spiritual authority now arrogated by the Roman see.

As this is an important era in ecclesiastical history, it may be worth while to briefly review the state of things at this period.

The Emperor Maurice had been favourably disposed to Gregory, and had received, in return, assurances of the highest respect. He, however, seems to have regarded with indifference the dispute between Gregory and John about the title of *Universal Bishop*, and thereby to have lost the friendship of Pope Gregory. Maurice had in his army a centurion named Phocas, a man of the lowest passions and worst character, who, taking advantage of a mutiny among the soldiers, murdered the emperor, with circumstances of the utmost atrocity, and possessed himself of the imperial throne, after putting to death ten of the imperial family, and endeavouring to cut off all whose nobility, or wisdom, or reputation had raised them above the common rank. Gregory, to his indelible disgrace, expressed the highest satisfaction, and employed the strongest terms of adulation towards the miscreant who had thus usurped the throne of his murdered master. His letter begins with, "Glory be to God on high, who, according as it is written, changes times, and transfers kingdoms," and

the like, and proceeds to represent the happy advantages the world would reap under the benign influences of his government. Perhaps he anticipated that Phocas, if flattered and supported, might not be unwilling to punish the Bishop of Constantinople for the protection he had striven to afford, during the rebellion, to the children of Maurice; and the hope of the withdrawal of the permission which the late emperor had given to the bishop of that city to bear the title of *Universal* may, perhaps, account for, though it cannot excuse or justify, the base flatteries of Gregory towards a monster who had violated every moral sanction.

The historian, Gibbon, has thus described Phocas, in terms which certainly did not exaggerate his character or vices—"Ignorant of letters, of laws, and even of arms, he indulged in the supreme rank a more ample privilege of lust and drunkenness, and his brutal pleasures were either injurious to his subjects or disgraceful to himself. Without assuming the office of a prince, he renounced the profession of a soldier; and the reign of Phocas afflicted Europe with ignominious peace and Asia with desolating war. His savage temper was inflamed by passion, hardened by fear, exasperated by resistance or reproach."

It was at the hands, however, of this tyrannical monster that the successor of Pope Gregory, Boniface III., is said to have obtained an edict commanding that the Church of Rome should be styled and esteemed the "Head of all Churches," and the Pope, "*Universal Bishop*"—the very title which his predecessors, Pelagius and Gregory, had proclaimed to be so vain, proud, profane, wicked, blasphemous, devilish, and antichristian, when claimed by their rival the bishop of the imperial city. The conduct of Pope Gregory shows the profound fear he entertained that the chief place would be transferred to the metropolis of the East, in the same way by which it came to his own, and surely not without reason. Byzantium had once been a poor suffragan bishopric, under the jurisdiction of Heraclea; when the city grew to greatness as the eastern metropolis of the empire, we have seen that the bishopric took rank next to Rome, in spite of all the remonstrances which the Bishops of old Rome could make against it, displacing all the ancient patriarchates. Alexandria in the same way preceded Antioch—on what ground it would be difficult to say, unless that it was the second chief city of the world. What was there, then, to prevent Constantinople assuming ere long the first rank, and displacing the precedence of the ancient capital of the empire itself? as some of its archbishops or patriarchs were evidently aiming to do in arrogating to themselves the exclusive title of *Universal Bishop*.

So clear is it to every well-read student in ecclesiastical history that this exclusive universal pastorship in any one bishop was not even thought of in primitive ages, that Father Newman himself, before he seceded from the Church of England—but while it must be admitted that he was not only well read in ecclesiastical history, but was not at all prejudiced against the Church of Rome—thus writes in his 7th lecture on Romanism and Protestantism (p. 217): "What there is not the shadow of a reason for saying that the fathers held, what has not the faintest pretensions of being a catholic truth, is this, that St. Peter, or his successors, were and are universal bishops; that they have the whole of Christendom for their own diocese, in a way which other Apostles and Bishops had and have not; that they are a bishop of bishops in such sense as belongs to no other bishops; in fact, that the difference between St. Peter and the popes after him, and other bishops, is not one of mere superiority and degree, but of kind; not of rank, but of class. This the Romanists hold; and they do not hold it by Catholic tradition, but by private interpretation of Scripture."

While, however, we have said enough to show that the popes had no divine or exclusive right to claim the title of *Universal Bishop*, we ought, perhaps, before leaving the subject, to remind or warn our studious readers that there is a modified, or rather a metaphorical, sense in which, long before the alleged grant of Phocas to Boniface III., not only certain Bishops of Rome, but bishops of many other principal sees, were styled "*Universal Bishops*."

We mean the sense in which the title was considered to import a general care and solicitude over all the Christian Churches. Bishop Stillingfleet has given an elaborate examination of this subject in his chapter on the title of *Universal Bishop*.^a The following passages may suffice to explain our meaning:—

"We should consider, that power and authority in the Bishop of the Church is given with an immediate respect to the good of the whole Church; so that if it were possible that every particular bishop could take care of the whole Church they have authority enough by their function to do it. But it not only being impossible that every bishop should do it, but it being inconsistent with peace and order, that all should undertake it, therefore it was necessary that there should be some bounds set, for the more convenient management of that authority which they had. From hence came the original of particular dioceses, that within such a compass they might better exercise the power which they enjoyed. As if many lights be placed in a great room, though the intention of

every one of them is to give light to the whole room, yet that this might be the better done, these lights are conveniently placed in the several parts of it. And this is what St. Cyprian means in that famous expression of his, that there is but one bishopric in the whole world, a part of which is held by every bishop; for the Church in common is designed as the diocese of all bishops, which is set out into several apartments, for the more advantageous governing of it."

He then goes on to another striking illustration of the idea he wishes to convey:—

"As a flock of many thousand sheep, being committed to the care of many shepherds, these have all an eye to the good of the whole flock, but do not, therefore, sit all together in one place to oversee it, but every one hath his share to look after, for the benefit of the whole; but yet so, that upon occasion one of them may extend his care beyond his own division, and may be very useful to the whole by counsel and direction. Thus we find it was in the primitive Church, though every bishop had his particular charge, yet still they regarded the common good of the whole Church, and upon occasion did extend their counsel and advice far beyond their particular Churches, and exercised their functions in other places besides those which the Church's convenience had allotted to them."

In this sense the title of "*Universal Bishop*" was not unfrequently applied to bishops of other distinguished sees as well as to those of Rome, without being understood to involve any superiority in power or jurisdiction over other bishops, or disparagement to the independence of the latter, beyond what of necessity was involved in the subordination of bishops to their metropolitans, and of metropolitans to patriarchs, from the period when each of these ranks successively grew up in the Church.

This not only appears by what St. Gregory Nazianzen says of St. Cyprian in his xviii. oration,¹ "that he presided not only over the Church of Carthage and Africa, but over all the regions of the west, and over the east and south, and northern parts of the world also;" and, in like manner, of St. Athanasius, "That in being made Bishop of Alexandria he was made bishop of the whole world;" and by what St. Chrysostom says of Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, that he was instructed by the Holy Spirit that he was not only to have the care of that Church over which he was set, but of the whole Church throughout the world,² but, to save multiplying instances, the whole is summed up by an eminent Roman Catholic French writer of the 16th century, Simon Vigorius, thus—"When the Western Fathers call the Roman Bishops, Bishops of the Universal Church, they do it from the custom of their Churches, not that they look on them as universal bishops of the whole Church, but in the same sense that the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem are called so, or as they are universal over the Churches under their patriarchate, or that in Ecumenical Councils they preside over the whole Church."³ Keeping this distinction in mind, the student of early ecclesiastical history will find everything on the subject clear and consistent, though without it, Pope Gregory's letters would appear inconsistent and inexplicable.

After all this, what becomes of Dr. Geraghty's boasted title of *Universal Bishop*, which he now has been obliged to substitute for the more high-sounding one of *Universal Hierarchy*, a title which, a month ago, he so confidently asserted had been granted to Pope Leo I. by the Council of Chalcedon, until we exposed the misquotation—a charge from which, we presume, he has found it impossible to extricate himself, as, while alluding to the subject in his present letter, he attempts neither defence nor apology.

CURIOSITIES OF ROMANISM.—II.

In presenting to our readers the specimen of the "curiosities" of the Romish system of religion contained in our last number, we were quite aware of the manner in which the Papal controversialist is accustomed to meet all such objections to his Church, if objections he admits them to be. They are only, he will say, the theories and opinions of canonists and casuists. It was merely *Dens qui thus* wrote and thought. But the opinions of a single divine are not to be taken or treated as matters of faith, or as the voice of the universal Church. Thus, Proteus-like, the Roman advocate eludes the fair consequences derivable from the monstrously absurd disquisitions which abound in such authorized and authenticated teachers as the author just referred to, or even in the pages of "the angelical Doctor" himself. Nevertheless, we still must hold that Church as fully accountable for all such false and absurd

¹ Tom. I. p. 281, Morell's edit. Paris, 1630.

² Oration xxi., id. p. 377. See also St. Basil, Epist. 69, tom. iii., Ben. ed., p. 163, where St. Basil speaks of Athanasius as "having the care of all the Churches, as much as of that which was peculiarly committed to him."

³ Oper. Chrysost. tom. ii., p. 607, Ben. ed. Paris, 1718.

⁴ Opera omnia Simonis Vigorij, Paris, 1683, ad responsionem Syn. Concil. Basil. Comment. p. 37-38.—"Et harum rerum ignari andabamus nostri non advertant, cum Occidentales Patres Pontifices Romanos vocant Universales Ecclesie, id more suorum Ecclesiarum facere, et ea notione, non quod possent totius orbis universales, universales esse Episcopos, sed eadem que Constantinopolitanus, Alexandrinus, Antiochenus, Hierosolymitanus, dicuntur universales; aut ut universales Ecclesie quae sunt sub eorum Patriarchatu; aut quod in Conciliis Ecumenicis totae Ecclesiae praesent."

^a See Stillingfleet's works, vol. iv., p. 408, &c.

¹ "Consecrator meus Joannes vocari Universalis Episcopus conatur. Exclamare compellor ac dicere: O tempora! O mores! Sacerdotes vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt; et novis ac profanis vocabulis gloriantur. Nuncquid ego, hic in re, propriam causam defendo? Nuncquid specialem injuriam video, et non magis causam Omnipotentis Dei, et causam Universalis Ecclesiae? Sed abest a cordibus Christianorum nomen illud blasphemum, in quo omnium sacerdotum honor admittitur, dum ab uno sibi dementem arrogatur.—Pep. Gregor. I., lib. iv., ep. xx. opera. tom. ii., p. 748. Ben. Ed.

² "Nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit: quia, videlicet, si unus Patriarcha Universalis dicitur, Patriarcharum nomen ceteris derogatur. Sed abest hoc, abest a Christiana mente, id sibi velle quoniam arripere, unde fratrum suorum honorem imminuere ex quantalibet parte videatur.—Greg. Epist. lib. 5, ep. 43, opera. tom. ii., p. 771.

³ "Tu id Christo, Universalis scilicet Ecclesiae capiti, in extremi iudicii ex dictis examine, qui cuncta ejus membra timet conaris Universalis appellatione supponere? Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverso vocabulo, nisi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui de peccatis angelorum legionibus secum sociatiter constituit, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere?"—Lib. v., Ep. 18, tom. ii., p. 742.

⁴ "Ego vero fidenter dico, quia quicquid se Universalium Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari desiderat, in elatione sua Antichristum praecurrit, quia, superbiendo, ceteris praeposit."—Lib. vii. epist. 33, t. ii., p. 881. Lib. xiii., Epist. 31, tom. ii., p. 1238.